Dear Dave, 11/15/91

Along with the Post's coverage of yesterday'd indictment of two Libyans for the PanAm plane bombing I'll include the local version of the bobtailed story AP provides on its State wire. That may have been cut further locally.

Aside from the details that may or may not be worth your time this provides still another illustration of major-media failure.

From recollection the Post made no mention of the White House threat of military action. And in talking about economic measures for which international support would be sought, how that might be greeted, responded to is not indicated, along with no reference to precedent.

I doubt the smaller countries will go along voluntarily if this gets to be any more than administration talk with an eye on the coming election.

Many countries, I believe, will regard Libya's guilt as no worse than US guilt in its violations of law in bombing Libya for terrorism I think it later turned out was Syrian.

Some may wonder how it differs from what the US did in Grenada, Panama and other countries, including by proxy.

Although the disclosed case appears to be solid and my be there remains the US history of using such cases for domestic political ends and of lying. For example on this very matter, by attributing it to Syria at the time, with some help to it by as I now recall Iran.

As of now I think there will be nothing more. Perhaps the indictments were timed to help in Barr's confirming as AG or for other ends.

Perhaps even to lessen the onus on Syria which remains on the terrorist list and yet is being cozied up to by the Bush administration.Particularly vs Israel.

There is no chance of extradition, as the administration knew. No extradition, no trial, no trial, no solution.

Meanwhile among other things terrorists will learn from what is disclosed how to avoid leaving such traces, as in using timing devises of varying origins.

Remember that during the Gulf oil crisis of several years ago when we were escorting ships and protecting them against Iranian attack and a U.S. ship was struck by an Iraqi missile-that did not discourage the GOP administrations from secretly helping Iraq.

Resumed 11/17. Appropriately for what I say above and for the today's Outlook story I attach is it that the major and most prominent stories in Outlook are on official lying.

You will, I think, recall that quite long ago, long before the beginning of the Madrid conference, long before there were a few officially unofficial Israeli comments that Bush had changed US Middle East policy for it to be against Israel, I was saying that and kept saying it. This coauthor of the book on the Pan Am 103 bombing now says this: "The United

States currently needs Syria's cooperation in the peace talks with Israel, and Syrian officials have recently told U.S. officials that they will not attend any peace talks in Washington as long as they are on the State Department's list of countries supporting international terrorism." (No doubt the reason the US persists in protraying Israel as the obdurate party.)

In connection with the opinion I offered several days ago, "As of now I think there will be nothing more," this story concludes, "the Pan Am investigation is now effectively finished," quoting a DJ "official," not named.

I do not recall seeing what Bush said 11/14 in the Post, quoted in the first graf of this story, "A lot of people thought it was the Syrians. The Syrians took a bum rap." Author Emerson interprets this immediately on announcement of the indictments: "President Bush seized the opportunity to exonerate the Syrian Government from culpability in the terrorist act."

Emerson also confirms my (p.1) recollection that "for 18 months...Iran as well as Syria was fingered" by official investigators. He also says that "It is important to remember that the final determination that Libya was exclusively responsible for the Pan Am 103 bombing represented a dramatic reversal in the initial thinking of investigators," again official and including Iran, in retaliation for the US shooting down of an Iranian commercial plane.

He also quotes the former head of the CIA's counter-terrorism section as not believing the Syrians were solely responsible. Throughout the story ~~this~~ more? (sent you clipping) is support for this thinking.

He quotes the official State Department spokesman as saying on the announcement of the indictments that "this was a Libyan government operation from start to finish."

Aside from what this also says about the major-media failings I've been talking about in straight factual reporting, which the Post - sort of - atones for belatedly, after the damage is not reversible, I remind you again that in the past I've said that my correct analyses are not an indication of any exceptional powers by me but rather are an indication of the dishonesty and ~~of~~ incimpetence of the media. If I could see this clearly, they should have been able to see much more clearly.

If any of what I said beginning so long ago about this I do not recall having seen or heard any such comment or analyses in any of the media.

This also, I believe, confirms what I've been saying about the position of the Israeli government and the Bush determination to reorient US policy for that area to be against Israel and be in bed with the Arabs.

On reading Bem Bradlee's article on lying, the major and longest, I found more that is appropriate of which I refer to only a few of the lies he refers to. He was the Post's executive editor for years and he remains its vice=president at large, it says.

Referring to false official claims to national security to withhold he says that while the countries he lists as witting about the Cambodian bombing, all our "enemies" and

of course, Cambodia, "Only the American people had to be kept in the dark." He did his share of keeping the people in the dark!

I used his exact words in many FOIA lawsuits and the Post would not report it. Not even when I alleged and overwhelmingly proved perjury. (Which Hedrick Smith, then in the Washington bureau of the NYTimes, after consulting witha colleague whose name I do not now recall wrote me was not worth a news story.) I repeatedly called this to the Post's attention It never once covered any hearing o n this, never reported it in any way.

When I showed Bradlee how and that the FBI lied in its first five-volume report on the JFK assassination, excerpts from which I used in my first book, he decided to do a story ont it, omitted this in the story, which he reassigned from a reporter who was impressed by the book, Dan Kurzman, who soon left the post, the story assigned to one who survived and now is it ombudsman, Dick Harwood, and the story was reangled to make almost no mention of my book. They jumped the release date on Epstein's, Inquest, which is friendly toward and favorable to the FBI.

He refers to the Gulf of Tonkin incident, saying that none of the allegations by the LBJ administration were true. He also says that nobody knew the truth until the appearance of a book by Admiral, then commander Stockdale, who as a pilot had overflow the area, "But all this did not become known Stockdale.... wrote his version of the truth."
Technically this is true but it is at least misleading and it is still another revelation of the incompetence or badication of the major media. (Wasn't Joe Goulden's book the first?)

In fact it was "known" virtually immediately, at least by me, and my sole sources were the major media's reporting. I was then researching the planned book, "Tiger to Ride." This was one of several incidents I analysed contemporaneously and correctly. I loaned my analysis to Howard Roffman. I think he returned it and that it is in my "Tiger" file.

Still again, if I could perceive the very obvious truth, the the whole thing had been invented, with my only information coming from the major media, can it be that this same media is so incompetent it cannot understand the clear meaning of what it publishes?

As I read further in Outlook I come to the editorial, "The Lockerbie Indictments." The editorial begins by praising them, then admits they were challenged "by some," not including the Post and not given much attention by it (that I recall none does not mean there was none), in connection with which it asks if this was "to take the heat off Palestinians and Syrians" as well as Iran over the peace conference and hostages."

The Post says the "issue cannot be put to rest now," perhaps because the editorial writers did not read the stories cited, because "it is important to note that there is a qualitative difference between hard information that will stand up in court and (sic) "the sort of intelligence information and inferences from past conduct that are common coin in the political arena."

Like, no doubt, the "hard evidence" cited by the US for the Viet Nam war, what we

to Cambodia, Grenada, Panama and so many other countries and we also used as the basis for our intrusions in so many other countries, particularly in Latin America?

This is exactly what Pradlee and the other story complain about, misuse of word to have the effect of lying.